

Attendance is open to the interested public. With advance notice to the Chairperson, members of the public may make oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present oral statements should notify the Executive Director no later than one day before the meeting. Any member of the public may present a written statement to the Committee at any time.

T.H. Gilmour,

Captain, Coast Guard, Captain of the Port
New York, NYHTMAC Executive Director

[FR Doc. 94-30584 Filed 12-12-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 94-38; Notice 2]

Chrysler Corporation; Decision on Petition for Determination of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Chrysler Corporation (Chrysler) of Auburn Hills, Michigan, determined that some of its vehicles failed to comply with the outside mirror requirements of 49 CFR 571.111, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 111, "Rearview Mirrors," and filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." Chrysler also petitioned to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 1381 *et seq.*) (now 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120) on the basis that the noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the petition was published on May 17, 1994, and an opportunity afforded for comment (59 FR 25699). This notice grants Chrysler's petition with respect to some of the noncomplying motor vehicles and denies it with respect to the remainder.

Paragraph S7.1 of FMVSS No. 111 requires that trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of more than 10,000 pounds have outside mirrors of unit magnification.

During the 1989 through early-1994 model years, Chrysler manufactured an estimated total of 26,700 Dodge Ram 350 and 3500 pickup trucks and cab/chassis with convex, passenger-side, outside, rearview mirrors.

Chrysler supported its petition for inconsequential noncompliance with the following (Chrysler also submitted two figures which compared the fields of view of the noncompliant mirrors to two types of compliant mirrors. This material is available in the NHTSA docket):

(1) The affected vehicles are also equipped with a driver side outside rear view mirror of unit magnification and, except for the less than 100 cab/chassis models, an inside rear view mirror of unit magnification.

(2) The installed 6" x 9" convex passenger side mirror meets all requirements of S5 of FMVSS 111 [passenger car requirements], and provides increased field of view capability when compared to the same size mirror of unit magnification or the optional 10" x 7" unit magnification mirror.

(3) Other than the passenger side mirror being convex rather than unit magnification, the rear view mirror system on the affected vehicles meets or exceeds all performance and location requirements of FMVSS 111. The system capability is adequate in all regards, specifically including provision for both overall system and passenger side field of view.

(4) Chrysler is not aware of any owner complaints, field reports or allegations of hazardous circumstances relating to performance of the passenger side mirror on the affected vehicles.

(5) The subject condition occurred as the result of the upgrading of a model for the 1989 model year to more than 10,000 pounds GVWR. That model for prior model years had been equipped with a convex passenger side mirror and unit magnification driver side and inside rear view mirrors. The same mirror system was carried over on the vehicles for which the GVWR was upgraded. Rear view adequacy of the convex mirror was not affected by the GVWR increase, and the need to instead release a unit magnification mirror for compliance to the FMVSS 111 requirement at the upgraded GVWR was inadvertently overlooked at the time and thereafter.

(6) From a practical vehicle operation and motor vehicle safety standpoint, the mirror system which fully complied to all FMVSS 111 requirements on earlier model year vehicles was equivalently effective and capable on the upgraded GVWR vehicles.

(7) Existence of the variance was detected during an engineering analysis resulting from a question of mirror size adequacy on certain 1994 subject models. Size was determined to not be a concern, but the analysis uncovered the convex mirror issue. Chrysler then took immediate, expedited action to correct the condition by specifying and installing the optional 10" x 7" unit magnification mirrors on affected vehicles.

Chrysler summarized its rationale for granting its petition with the following.

Existence of the subject condition was totally inadvertent and not a deliberate attempt to evade Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard requirements. Therefore, in spite of good faith and due care efforts by Chrysler, some vehicles with a GVWR of more than 10,000 pounds were manufactured and shipped with a convex passenger side outside rear view mirror. Upon discovery of the condition, Chrysler took immediate action to correct it in production and minimize the number of vehicles produced with the convex mirror.

No comments were received on the petition.

NHTSA has reviewed FMVSS No. 111 and Chrysler's arguments. The reason that convex magnification mirrors are permitted for passenger side mirrors on vehicles whose GVWR is less than 10,000 pounds and not for heavier vehicles is that when a vehicle is very large it is important for its operator to be able to look in the mirrors to see the vehicle and its immediate surroundings when in motion. For example, if an operator is attempting to back a longer vehicle into a confined space, a mirror of unit magnification will give a view which is undistorted, thus reducing the chances that the vehicle will collide with anything in its path due to an error in perception by the operator. A convex mirror yields a slightly distorted perspective of the surroundings in order to obtain a larger field of view. This distortion could produce adverse effects if the vehicle is very long.

Chrysler stated that the rearview adequacy of the convex mirrors was not affected by the upgrade in GVWR. This change consisted of adding an extra wheel to the rear axle on each side of the vehicle in order to give it a greater load capacity. While this does increase the width of the vehicle to 93 inches, the modification adds nothing to the length of the truck, and should not affect the ability of the operator to judge the driving environment to the rear and side of the truck. NHTSA has concluded, therefore, that safety does not require that the vehicles be refitted with a convex mirror on the passenger side. However, this conclusion applies to the completed vehicles only. With respect to the 90 cab/chassis that have been produced with the noncompliant mirror, NHTSA notes that these incomplete vehicles could have a number of types of bodies added by a final stage manufacturer, such as ambulance, cargo compartment, and cherry picker. Because of the variance in possible equipment which could be added to the chassis, there is no way to assess the effect on safety of the noncompliance on the completed vehicle. Because these vehicles could be completed in a way which could significantly obstruct a vehicle operator's view, it is impossible to decide that the noncompliance is inconsequential with respect to them, and NHTSA believes that they should be equipped with a unit magnification mirror as the standard requires.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Administrator has decided that Chrysler has met its burden of persuasion with respect to the 26,610 completed pickup trucks described in its petition, and that the noncompliance of these vehicles with FMVSS No. 111 is inconsequential.

as it relates to safety. Accordingly, with respect to the completed pickup trucks, the Administrator exempts Chrysler from the notification requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30118 and the remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30120. The Administrator has further decided that Chrysler has not met its burden of persuasion with respect to the 90 cab/chassis incomplete vehicles described in the petition, and denies Chrysler's petition with respect to these motor vehicles.

(49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 49 CFR 501.8)

Issued on: December 8, 1994.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 94-30591 Filed 12-12-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

[Docket No. 94-61; Notice 2]

Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Company; Grant of Petition for Determination of Inconsequential Noncompliance

The Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Company (Uniroyal) of Greenville, South Carolina, determined that some of its tires failed to comply with 49 CFR 571.109, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 109, "New Pneumatic Tires," and filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." Uniroyal also petitioned to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301—Motor Vehicle Safety on the basis that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the petition was published on July 19, 1994, and an opportunity afforded for comment (59 FR 36832). This notice grants Uniroyal's petition.

Paragraph S4.3.3(b) of FMVSS No. 109 specifies that each tire be labeled with an identification number, the last three digits of which represent the week and year of manufacture. During the period of the 17th through the 20th week of 1994, Uniroyal manufactured approximately 2,800 P175/70R13 MOTOMASTER LE tires with an incorrect week and year of manufacture contained in the tire identification number. The last three digits in the identification numbers on the subject tires are incorrectly marked "167," "168," "169," and "120." The last three digits in the identification numbers for these tires should be "174," "184," "194," and "204" signifying the 17th, 18th, 19th, and 20th weeks of 1994. All tires are sold only in the replacement market.

Uniroyal supported its petition for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

[Uniroyal does] not believe that this error will impact motor vehicle safety since only the week and year of manufacture is incorrect.

Uniroyal offered further rationale in its Part 573 Report.

The dates marked on these tires could be interpreted as the year 1987 through 1990 or 1997 through 2000. This tire line was introduced during the fourth quarter of 1992; therefore, there would not be pre-existent tires with these numbers. In the event a recall is necessary prior to the week and year (years 1997 through 2000) marked on these tires, there will be no tires that were actually manufactured during these weeks. If it is necessary to recall these tires during or after the weeks marked, the recall population would comprise both the mismarked and properly marked tires.

No comments were received on the petition.

NHTSA has reviewed FMVSS No. 109 and the petitioner's arguments. The primary purpose that the identification number serves is to facilitate identification of tires that are the subject of notification and remedy campaigns. The erroneous date code marking does not affect the ability to identify the tires in the event a campaign is conducted either before or after the erroneously indicated manufacture date. If a recall campaign is required on the tires before the 16th week of 1997, their date code, like any tire's conforming date code, permits instant identification of a tire in the recall population. Should a campaign be required on tires of this tire line manufactured during the 16th weeks of 1997, 1998, and 1999, and the 12th week of 2000, or on the tires in question, the petitioner will have to campaign both sets of tires, compliant tires as well as noncompliant ones, but this is a burden to be borne by the petitioner and does not affect safety in a negative way.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Administrator has decided that Uniroyal has met its burden of persuasion and that the noncompliance herein described is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, the Administrator exempts Uniroyal from the notification requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30118, and the remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30120.

(49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on December 8, 1994.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 94-30592 Filed 12-12-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Bilingual Teacher Training Project

ACTION: Notice—request for proposals.

SUMMARY: The Executive Office of the United States Information Service (USIS) at the American Embassy in Brasilia announces an open competition for an assistance award. Public or private non-profit organizations meeting the provisions described in IRS regulation 501(c)(3) may apply to plan and conduct a three-week seminar in English-language teaching and American culture for approximately 30 Brazilian Bilingual Center teachers selected by USIS.

Overall grant making authority for this program is contained in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Public Law 87-256, as amended, also known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. The purpose of the Act is "to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries * * * to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations * * * and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world." The funding authority for the program cited above is provided through Reorganization Plan No. 2 of March 1978, E.O. 12048 dated March 27, 1978 and the Federal Grants and Cooperative Agreements Act of 1977 (P.L. 95-224).

Programs and projects must conform with Agency requirements and guidelines outlined herein. USIS projects and programs are subject to the availability of funds.

ANNOUNCEMENT NAME AND NUMBER: All communications with USIS concerning this announcement should refer to the above title and reference number USIS/BSB-94-001.

DATES: Deadline for proposals: All copies must be received at the U.S. Information Service, American Embassy (BSB), Unit 3500, APO AA 34030, by 5 p.m. Washington, D.C. time on 3rd day February, 1995. Faxed documents will not be accepted, nor will documents postmarked on 3rd day of February but received at a later date. U.S. Postal Service can take up to ten days for mail to be delivered. Proposals received after February 3, 1995 will not be accepted. Is the responsibility of each grant

applicant that proposals are received by the above deadline.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Executive Officer, USIS, American Embassy, Brasilia, Brazil at fax number 55-61-321-2833 or telephone 55-61-321-7272, Ext. 324 to request a Solicitation Package, which includes more detailed award criteria; all application forms; and guidelines for preparing proposals, including specific criteria for preparation of the proposal budget. Please specify the Binational Teacher Training Project on all inquiries and correspondence. Interested applicants should read the complete **Federal Register** announcement before addressing inquiries to the Executive Officer or submitting their proposals. Once the RFP deadline has passed, the Executive Office may not discuss this competition in any way with applicants until after the proposal review process has been completed.

ADDRESSES: Applicants must follow all instructions given in the Application Package and send only complete applications to: U.S. Information Service, American Embassy (Bsb), Unit 3500, APO AA 34030 Attn: Executive Officer Ref.: USIS/BSB-94-001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the authorizing legislation, programs must maintain a non-political character and should be balanced and representative of the diversity of American political, social, and cultural life. "Diversity" should be interpreted in the broadest sense and encompass differences including but not limited to race, gender, religion, geographic location, socio-economic status, and physical challenges. Applicants are strongly encouraged to adhere to the advancement of this principle.

Overview

Participants should receive advanced training in EFL: course and curriculum design, teacher training and management skills, evaluation and testing, with an intensive American Studies component. Special emphasis should be placed on incorporating American Studies materials into an intercultural curriculum. Since this will be the first U.S. experience for many of the participants, the program should introduce the participants to U.S. life, institutions, values, and culture through classes, field trips, contacts with Americans, and community activities. The program should maintain a relative balance among discussion sessions, workshops, and practical experience and promote interaction among the participants. The project should also

include an individual research project for each participant.

Approximately 30 Brazilian nationals who are full time employees at a Binational Center in Brazil will participate in this program. Each participant is nominated by his/her institution for final selection by United States Information Service (USIS). Participants either teach English as a Foreign Language, administer English or American Studies programs, or provide teacher training in either English or American Studies. Participants will come on "B1-B2" visas issued by U.S. Consular Officers at American Embassy or Consulates in Brazil. USIS Brasilia will provide the university with biographical and professional data on each candidate.

The proposal should specifically address the following technical requirements:

U.S. Pre-Program Activities

After receiving the final participant list, the university is expected to do the following: send USIS a pre-departure information packet containing welcome and general information with practical suggestions for preparing the participants for their stay at the university. The participants will arrive directly at the program site from their home cities. The university program staff will be expected to make arrangements to have participants met upon arrival at the airport nearest the university campus. A substantive orientation should be provided shortly after all the participants' arrival at the university. The purpose of the orientation is to provide detailed information concerning the program, university, community, etc. It should also acquaint participants with one another, the university program, and the administrative staff. During this orientation a brief needs assessment is to be conducted to determine individual learning needs and to identify the topic of the individual research project. The Institute Director should be prepared to adjust program content, emphasis, and schedule as necessary to respond to participants' concerns.

The Educational Development

The educational development program should be a non-credit, intensive program of approximately 40 hours a week designed to meet the stated program objectives through interactive lectures and discussions, workshops, and hands-on learning experiences using university and community resources and opportunities. This course should not only emphasize EFL teaching skills, teacher training and

management skills, but also American culture and most importantly, how to integrate the teaching of American culture in EFL classrooms. The curriculum should be designed to challenge the participants to grow professionally. In addition, it should provide them with practical, hands-on learn-by-doing experiences. The students should receive materials that they can immediately adapt to their BNC classes in Brazil. Time should be allowed for students informally to pursue topics of personal interest.

The Brazilian teachers participating in this program are among the best English teachers in Brazil. Most already have a highly developed background in EFL based on years of teaching experience and exposure to materials and specialists from the U.S. Thus, the entire program should reflect the high academic level, sophistication and professional development of the participants.

Proposal should contain evidence of on-going evaluation and ability to make program adjustments, as well as evaluation of the entire program.

The Cultural Enrichment Program

The two goals of the Cultural Enrichment Program are to: 1) strengthen the participants' knowledge of U.S. life and culture through carefully designed interactive classes and community cultural activities and 2) provide an insight into the use of "cultural material" in the classroom. The relationship between language and culture should be explored. The cultural component of the program should allow students to explore the variety of American culture in both small towns and larger cities, experience the richness of the visual and performing arts in the U.S., and interact with local citizens.

Program Administration

All Institute programming and administrative logistics, the management of the Educational Development Program and the Cultural Enrichment Program, local transportation, on-site university arrangements (including housing, host-families, ordering and shipping of educational materials, general program support, etc.) and maintaining current information regarding Internal Revenue Service regulations will be the responsibility of the Institute grantee.

Participants should be housed in the same facility, preferably a modern dormitory with no more than two persons to a room, adequately climate-controlled for the area and sufficient bathroom facilities. Three hot meals a

day must be provided. Extra-curricular activities such as field trips, Fourth of July celebrations, brief homestays and other social and recreational activities should be provided. Each participant will arrive with valid U.S. health insurance. Describe the available health and/or local health care system and plan to provide health care access. Transportation to and from the airport and local transportation between the cultural activities must be provided.

Timing

Grant will begin May 15, 1995. Note: the participants will arrive in July, 1995. The grant start date allows for time to prepare for the students' arrival. No funds may be expended until the grant agreement is signed.

Goals

The goals of the program include providing an overview of the state of the art of American EFL, identifying sources of information for materials and curriculum development, and designing a challenging individualized academic program for each participant which will promote an increased understanding of U.S. culture and society.

Funding

This project is a cost-share program with USIS paying for the course curriculum, tuition, faculty costs and course materials. Participants pay their international travel and Binational Centers cover their meals and lodging.

Proposed Budget

A comprehensive line-item budget to include academic program and administrative fees, transportation, course fees, materials, fees for meals and lodging and cultural activities must be submitted with the proposal by the application deadline.

Applicants must submit a comprehensive budget for the entire program. There must be a summary budget as well as a break-down reflecting both the administrative budget and the program budget. For better understanding or further clarification, applicants may provide separate sub-budgets for each program component, phase, location, or activity in order to facilitate USIS decisions on funding. Allowable costs for the program include the following:

- (1) Academic Fees
- (2) Administrative Costs
- (3) Materials
- (4) Course Fees
- (5) Transportation
- (6) Meals for Participants
- (7) Lodging for Participants
- (8) Cultural Activities

USIS will acknowledge receipt of all proposals and will review them for technical eligibility. Proposals will be deemed ineligible if they do not fully adhere to the guidelines stated herein. Eligible proposals will be forwarded to a review panel consisting of the Deputy Public Affairs Officer, the Country Cultural Affairs Officer, the Regional English Teaching Officer and the Executive Officer. Funding decisions are at the discretion of the USIS Country Public Affairs Officer. Final technical authority for grant awards resides with the USIS Contracting Officer.

Review Criteria

Technically eligible applications will be competitively reviewed according to the criteria stated below. These criteria are not rank ordered and all carry equal weight in the proposal evaluation:

Overall Quality—Proposals should exhibit originality, creativity, substance and relevance to stated goals. This includes a high level of institutional commitment and flexibility, the quality of the program plan, adherence of the activity to the criteria and conditions described previously, and creative design in all program areas.

Program Planning—Detailed agenda and relevant work plan should demonstrate substantive undertakings and logistical capacity. Agenda and plan should adhere to the program overview and guidelines described herein.

TEFL Programs—Demonstrated experience with TEFL programs and teacher training; familiarity with Brazil and its network of binational centers is desirable.

American Studies—A well-planned proposal for an American cultural content of the program to include field trips, cultural experiences such as festivals, holiday celebrations and/or tourism.

Ability to Achieve Program Objectives—Appropriateness of proposed syllabus to goals and objectives stated herein; proposals should clearly demonstrate how the institution will meet the stated goals and objectives.

Administrative and Managerial Capabilities—Evidence of strong on-site administrative and managerial capabilities for hosting international visitors with specific discussion of how managerial and logistical arrangements will be undertaken.

Institutional Capacity—Proposed institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program's goals. Proposals should demonstrate potential for program excellence and/or track record of applicant institution. USIS will consider

the past performance of prior grantees and the demonstrated potential of new applicants. Brief resumes of key personnel should be included.

Institution's Record/Ability—Proposals should demonstrate an institutional record of successful exchange programs, including responsible fiscal management and full compliance with all reporting requirements for past USIA/USIS grants.

Project Evaluation—Proposals should include a plan to evaluate the success of the program from beginning to end. USIS recommends that the proposal include a draft survey questionnaire or other technique plus description of a methodology to use to link outcome to original project objectives. Award-receiving organizations/institutions will be expected to submit a detailed evaluation at the conclusion of the program.

Cost Effectiveness—The overhead and administrative components, as well as salaries and honoraria, should be kept as low as possible. All other items should be necessary and appropriate.

Notice

This RFP incorporates one or more clauses from the Federal Acquisition Regulations by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available.

Clause No.	Clause title	Date
52.222-21	Certification of Nonsegregated Facilities	Apr 84.
52.222-26	Equal Opportunity	Sept 78.
52.223-5	Certification Regarding a Drug Free Work Place	Jul 90.

Further, successful Grantee must certify that granted funds will be not used for lobbying or propaganda which is directed at influencing public policy decisions of the Government of the United States or any State or locality thereof.

The terms and conditions published in this RFP are binding and may not be modified by any USIA representative. Explanatory information provided by the Agency that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of the RFP does not constitute and award commitment on the part of the Government. The needs of the program may require the award to be reduced, revised, or increased. Final awards cannot be made until funds have been appropriated by Congress, allocated and

committed through internal USIA procedures.

Notification

All applicants will be notified of the results of the review process on or about February 22, 1995. Awards made will be subject to periodic reporting and evaluation requirements.

Dated: November 25, 1994.

Carl D. Howard,

Country Public Affairs Officer, USIS Brazil.

[FR Doc. 94-30526 Filed 12-12-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8230-01-M

U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy Meeting

AGENCY: United States Information Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: A meeting of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy will be held on December 14 in Room 600, 301 4th Street, S.W., Washington D.C. from 10:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

The Commission will visit the Voice of America for a briefing by Christopher Kern, Chief of Computer Services, on VOA's use of the internet for text and audio programming. The Commission will also meet with Dr. Barry Fulton, Associate Director, Information Bureau, U.S. Information Agency; Steven N. Goldstein, Program Director, Interagency & International Networking Coordination, National Science Foundation; and Dr. Ross Stapleton-Gray, Independent Consultant and Adjunct Professor, Georgetown University. Participants will discuss

global information infrastructure and the implications of digital technologies in public diplomacy.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Please call Betty Hayes, (202) 619-4468, if you are interested in attending the meeting. Space is limited and entrance to the building is controlled.

Dated: December 7, 1994.

Rose Royal,

Management Analyst, Federal Register Liaison.

[FR Doc. 94-30525 Filed 12-12-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8230-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Medical Care Reimbursement Rates for FY 95

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with provisions of OMB Circular A-11 section 12.5(a), revised reimbursement rates have been established by the Department of Veterans Affairs for inpatient and outpatient medical care furnished to beneficiaries of other Federal agencies during FY 1995. These rates will be charged for such medical care provided at health care facilities under the direct jurisdiction of the Secretary on and after December 1, 1994.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Walter J. Besecker, Director, Medical Care Cost Recovery Office (165), Veterans Affairs Central Office, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20420, (202) 219-4242.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Interagency Billing Rates for FY 1995 are as follows:

Medicine	\$767
Surgery	\$1,228
Spinal Cord Injury	\$692
Neurology	\$683
Blind Rehabilitation	\$599
Psychiatry	\$367
Intermediate Medicine	\$288
Rehabilitation Medicine	\$544
Substance Abuse	\$259
Nursing Home	\$218
Prescription—Refill	\$20
Outpatient*	\$177
Emergency Dental Outpatient	\$108

*Rate includes Dialysis treatment.

Prescription refill charges in lieu of the outpatient visit rate will be charged when the patient receives no service other than the Pharmacy outpatient service. These charges apply if the patient receives the prescription refills in person or by mail.

When medical services for beneficiaries of other Federal agencies are obtained by the Department of Veterans Affairs from private sources, the charges to the other Federal agencies will be the actual amounts paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs for such medical services.

Inpatient charges to other Federal agencies will be at the current Interagency per diem rate for the type of bed section or discrete treatment unit providing the care.

Dated: December 6, 1994.

Jesse Brown,

Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

[FR Doc. 94-30519 Filed 12-12-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320-0-M